

about deficit reduction, the fact is there was no cut in spending. The fact is the spending still continues at 5 percent and the cuts, the deficit reductions were bookkeeping things and raising taxes. We still continued. So we are talking not about cutting overall spending. We are talking about reducing the growth. I thank the Senator.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator might remember, he and I were both in the House of Representatives back when President Bush—I criticized him publicly because of some of the assumptions he came up with in his budget resolution as to growth assumptions. A lot of people do not realize for each 1 percent growth in economic activity, there is a generation of new revenue of about \$24 billion. He was a little overly optimistic on some of the projections his people put forward for him also on gas tax revenues and some of the other things.

I think we want to be realistic. We want to get to where we are going and that is to eliminate the deficit by the year 2002. I would like to do it by the year 2000 instead of 2002. I think most of us would. But we are on the road to doing something realistic. Let us stay with it.

Mr. THOMAS. We are. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will join Senator BAUCUS and Senator ROCKEFELLER in introducing the Rural Health Improvement Act of 1995.

The purpose of this legislation is to establish within Medicare a rural hospital flexibility program.

Such a program is badly needed. Many smaller rural communities, and their hospitals, are unable to sustain the full range of hospital services necessary to qualify for participation in the Medicare Program. There are several reasons for this. Among the most important is that the Medicare rules and requirements for full service hospitals are burdensome and inflexible. Compliance with them is difficult for smaller rural facilities. Furthermore, Medicare reimbursement is inadequate. This latter problem is compounded by the fact that these hospitals are likely to be dependent on the program—most of their patients in any given year are likely to be Medicare beneficiaries. Thus, most of their reimbursement comes from the Medicare Program.

As a consequence, under the current Medicare rules and reimbursement levels, many of these small, rural hospitals across the country could go out of business. If they do, their communities would lose their current access to emergency medical services.

This legislation could make the difference between survival and closure for these hospitals. In Iowa, there are at least 10 hospitals, perhaps more,

which could qualify for participation in the program this legislation would establish.

This legislation would help those hospitals to continue offering essential hospital services in at least four ways: It would provide more appropriate and flexible staffing and licensure standards. It would reimburse both inpatient and outpatient services on a reasonable cost basis. It would promote integration of these hospitals in broader networks by requiring participating States to develop at least one rural health network in which the rural critical access hospital would participate. And it would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to recommend to the Congress an appropriate reimbursement methodology under Medicare for telemedicine services.

Hospitals which participate in this program could thus continue to provide an essential point of access to hospital level services in their rural communities. Essentially, these hospitals could pare back the services they offer to emergency care services and to 24-hour nursing services, while continuing to participate in the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis. In this way, they would continue to be the major point of access to emergency medical care in their communities.

Again, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senator BAUCUS and Senator ROCKEFELLER, and I commend their leadership on this problem.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I wish to continue the discussion begun this morning by my fellow freshman Senators on the President's budget proposal introduced last week.

Mr. President, I am pleased to see that President Clinton has joined Republicans in at last recognizing the need—the critical need—to balance the Federal budget.

But while the President's new position is a dramatic policy reversal from his previously stated view, and his new budget proposal is an improvement over his last one which did nothing to reign in the growth of government, the President's budget does not go nearly far enough.

Mr. President, the President's logic that slowing the path of deficit reduction would ease the pain on the elderly, on students, on the disabled, and the economy just does not hold up. In fact, the reverse is true. Delaying balancing the budget is more costly in the long run, as we run up more and more debt and higher and higher interest payments. And according to CBO, expected

reductions in interest rates that would result under the Republican balanced budget plan are not certain to materialize under the President's plan. This means that under the President's plan, home mortgages, business loans, credit card interest, and virtually everything that is affected by interest rates in this country would be more expensive. And finally, delaying balance for 10 years runs the risk that we may never get there if we do not put our country on a strict diet of spending discipline beginning now.

President Clinton has recognized that there must be spending restraint on entitlement programs, such as Medicare and Medicaid, if we are to achieve balance, and I commend him for at least talking the talk of entitlement reform. But the President's specific proposals are troublesome. The Clinton June budget actually spends \$1 billion more in nondefense discretionary spending than did his February budget. And it relies on overly optimistic estimates relating to economic growth and the cost of increases in Medicare and Medicaid. These rosy estimates, while appearing to be only slightly different from congressional estimates in the early years, are greatly magnified over a 10-year period. As a result, deficits will be much higher if analyzed using Congressional Budget Office figures.

According to the Congressional Budget Office—who Mr. Clinton once exalted and now deplures—Mr. Clinton's latest budget will fall far short of its goals, and like the last budget Mr. Clinton sent to Capitol Hill, will still leave the Nation in debt by as much as \$234 billion by the year 2002.

It is clear to me what the President wants to do. He very much wants to balance the budget. He knows that balancing the budget is the right thing to do. But he really does not want to make the hard choices that must be made if we are going to truly put America back on the road to fiscal health.

The President's budget proposals relating to health care are indicative of the President's split-personality budget. He first takes a lower baseline for Medicare and Medicaid, which in plain terms means how much these programs are projected to cost over the next 10 years. This averts some pain by saying, "It's really not as bad as we thought." Then the President's budget proposal reduces spending for Medicare—only by cutting payments to providers. In effect, the President is saying, "Let's reduce spending for Medicare, but only if it doesn't hurt anyone." There are no proposed changes for payments to beneficiaries or real reform of the system.

Mr. President, this approach does not make any sense in 1995. We must reform Medicare to save Medicare, to improve it, to preserve it. We have to change the program so that it is preserved for generations to come. We will never ensure long-term solvency of the Medicare program by just continuing

to cut payments to health care providers. Republicans have instead proposed restructuring the Medicare program to save it and improve it. The Republican plan would expand choice, for our seniors and our disabled, and would increase market efficiencies and reduce waste. The President's plan, on the other hand, would only postpone bankruptcy of the Medicare program until 2005.

Mr. President, while I admire the President's goals, I believe that the President's latest budget submission is yet one more case of failing to adequately address the crisis at hand and choosing instead to respond to critics by producing a budget designed for domestic political consumption rather than the welfare of the American people.

I hope the President will work with the Republicans. We, on our side of the aisle, have made some tough choices, and there are more to come. But I know the American people are with us, and they will put the interests of the country ahead of special interests. They voted for the fundamental change that Republicans have proposed and we must honor our commitment to the Americans who sent us to Washington last November.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.
Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to commend our distinguished colleague. We are indeed fortunate, not only here in the Senate but the United States, to have one who made this important career change having dedicated his life to saving lives in his career. Now, he brings to the institution of the Senate enormous knowledge, not only personal but that gained from working with his colleagues in the medical profession for these many years, such that we can have the benefit of his wisdom and experience as we address the critical issues relating to health care. I express my appreciation to the Senator for these remarks this morning. They are very timely.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE STAFFORD

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, one of the most remarkable public servants in Kansas history was Frank Carlson, who served in this Chamber for 18 years.

During his career, Senator Carlson also served for 4 years as a member of the Kansas House of Representatives, 12 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, and 4 years as Governor.

Senator Carlson did many great things in his career, including helping to draft Dwight Eisenhower for President in 1952.

But I am here this morning to talk about another great thing that Frank Carlson did. And that is the fact that he brought George Stafford to Washington, DC.

George passed away last week, and I wanted to take a minute to remember

this outstanding Kansan and outstanding American.

George was executive secretary to Frank Carlson during his term as Governor, and followed him to Washington as his Senate administrative assistant.

He served in that role for 17 years with great intelligence and integrity, always reaching out to provide advice and support to young Kansans who were new in town.

In 1967, then-President Johnson appointed George to serve on the Interstate Commerce Commission. He remained on the commission until 1980, serving as its chairman for 7 years.

George's years in Topeka and Washington are not the only examples of the service he gave to his country. He also defended freedom in World War II, rising to the rank of Captain, and receiving both the bronze star and the purple heart.

Like many in Kansas and in Washington, I was proud to call George Stafford my friend.

I know that Senator KASSEBAUM joins with me in extending our sympathies to Lena Stafford, George's wife of 48 years; his children; Bill, Susan, and Quincy; and his five grandchildren.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. GORDON SULLIVAN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise today to commend a truly remarkable individual, Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan, on his retirement after 36 years of service to our Army and to our Nation.

I had the distinct honor of working closely with General Sullivan over the years when he served as the deputy of the Command and Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, KS and during his command of the Big Red One at Fort Riley, KS.

Indeed, it was my pleasure to introduce General Sullivan before the Senate Armed Services Committee during his confirmation as chief of staff of the Army just 4 years ago.

In my view, Gordon Sullivan was exactly the right man at the right time to lead our Army during one of the most difficult periods of restructuring and downsizing. He kept the right perspective, and put it best in his own words, "smaller is not better, better is better."

Throughout his 4 years as Army Chief of Staff, General Sullivan kept his focus and vision. His priorities were our soldiers whom he prepared to fight and win our Nation's wars. And their families who support our soldiers and willingly sacrifice for their purpose.

I frequently conferred with General Sullivan throughout this term as Army Chief. His views and counsel were always on the mark. Gordon Sullivan brought tremendous wisdom to the job and a style of leadership which reflected his greatness.

Our Army will sorely miss General Sullivan, but it is stronger and better for his service. The legacy he leaves, a ready Army, a future force that will be

unmatched, and the deep love and devotion of his soldiers is fitting of this great man.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan for his sacrifice, his leadership, and his commitment to our soldiers and to our Nation.

God's speed and blessings to him and to his wife Gay, and their family.

TRIBUTE TO CLAIRE STERLING

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on Saturday last, in Arezzo, Italy, Claire Sterling died, age 76. So passed, as her great friend Meg Greenfield put it, "one of the great journalists of all time."

She was born in Queens, took her degree from Brooklyn College, and went from there to the Columbia graduate school of journalism. In time she joined the staff of the Reporter where she was a colleague of Ms. Greenfield for some 17 years, albeit from her post in Rome.

In her youth, as a student involved with student politics at Brooklyn College, and later as a union organizer, she came in contact with the Stalinist left which gave her a perspective, almost a second sense concerning ideological politics that ever thereafter informed her accounts of world politics at the highest, and yes, lowest, even criminal and clandestine levels. What liberals did not wish to know—many liberals, that is—and conservatives could not grasp, she instantly understood, and sublimely construed. There is a Hebrew saying, *ha mevin yavin*: those who understand, understand. Claire Sterling understood and not just at metaphysical heights. Who else would have persuaded the rebels opposing French rule in Algeria to let her know which trains she could take back to the coast which were not scheduled to be blown up.

Meg Greenfield allows as how "it is hard to think of her as dead, for she was so alive." And so we will remember her, even as we offer our condolences to her beloved husband Tom, and her son Luke, daughter Abigail, and her sister Ethel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1995]

CLAIRE STERLING, 76, DIES; WRITER ON CRIME AND TERROR
(By Eric Pace)

Claire Sterling, an American author and correspondent based in Italy, who was known for her writings on terrorism, assassination and crime, died yesterday in a hospital in Arezzo, Italy. She was 76 and lived outside of Cortona, near Arezzo.

She had cancer of the colon, her husband said.

Mrs. Sterling was based in Italy for more than 30 years and traveled widely. Her most